

## Student Conservation Association

Comments submitted by the OHMVR Division to individual grant applicants should in no way be construed as a guarantee of successful results for the applicant within the competitive grants process or a commitment of funding. Additionally, the lack of comments by the OHMVR Division to any specific applicant does not ensure successful results for the applicant within the competitive grant process or a commitment of funding.

All final applications will be reviewed by the OHMVR Division. The OHMVR Division may, at its sole discretion, decrease the requested amount and eliminate activities pursuant with regulation Section 4970.07.2 (f)(1-4) and for law enforcement projects, regulation Section 4970.15.3(b)(1-5).

Please note: If multiple proposed projects are requesting funding for the same deliverable, and multiple projects are successful, only one project will receive funding for the deliverable.

### General Evaluation Criteria

- #1iv – Selections should match the Land Manager's responses.
- #2 – Selections should match the Land Manager's responses.
- #4 – Selections should match the Land Manager's responses.
- #5 – The applicant should estimate the percentage of the 2008/09 OHV grant project deliverables to be accomplished by the end of the performance period.
- #7b & c – Narrative should match the Land Manager's response.
- #8a-d – Selections and narrative should match the Land Manager's responses.

Restoration	G09-04-23-R01
<b>Project Description</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comment.</li> </ul>	
<b>Project Cost Estimate</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff – The need for four Program managers is unclear. The applicant may want to provide further details to clarify.</li> <li>• Staff – Health insurance appears twice.</li> <li>• Staff – Costs for Project Development and Recruiting / Admissions does not appear directly related to the project and appears excessive. The applicant may want to provide further details to clarify the need.</li> <li>• Staff – Costs for Transportation to and from home or school are ineligible expenditures.</li> <li>• Staff – Costs for Program Support appear excessive and appear to be a duplicate of Service Hours. Applicant may want to provide further details to clarify.</li> <li>• Staff – Costs for Risk Management does not appear directly related to the project. The applicant may want to provide further details to clarify.</li> </ul>	

#### Project Cost Estimate (cont.)

- Staff – The Unit of Measure (UOM) is missing from most of the “Staff” costs.
- Materials / Supplies – The UOM is missing for all “Materials and Supplies”.
- Materials / Supplies – Costs for camping equipment appears twice.
- Equipment Use Expenses – The UOM is missing for all the “Equipment Use Expenses”.
- Equipment Use Expenses – Costs for the 4x4 vehicles appear excessive. Applicant may want to provide further details to clarify.
- Others – The UOM is missing for all the “Others” costs.
- Others – Utilities, postage, and mobile office expenses appears to be Indirect costs. Applicant may want to verify and move to appropriate category.
- Others – Costs for training and housing does not appear to be directly related to the project and appear excessive. Applicant may want to provide further details.
- Others – Office Expenses appear to be a duplicate of Mobile Office expenses.

#### Evaluation Criteria

- #4 – The narrative does not support the use of native plants and materials and educational signage.
- #7 – The narrative does not support conference calls.
- #8 – The applicant cannot list themselves as a partner.
- #8 – The name of the BLM field office name is missing.